UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1996/359
21 May 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 20 MAY 1996 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF THE SUDAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to enclose herewith the response of the Government of the Sudan to the statement by the Government of Uganda contained in Security Council document S/1996/288 of 16 April 1996 (see annex).

I would be grateful if the present letter and its enclosure were circulated as documents of the Security Council.

(Signed) Hamid Ali ELTINAY
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

96-12748 (E) 220596 230596

/...

Annex

Response of the Government of the Sudan to the statement by the Government of Uganda (S/1996/288, annex)

1. It was noticeable that the Government of Uganda was endeavouring to design its allegations against the Sudan in a manner that would match the interests of those who instigated and orchestrated the chorus to support their machinations in the Security Council to incriminate the Sudan. It is well known to all that the Government of Uganda is fighting civil wars against rebel movements not only in north Uganda, but also in central and eastern Uganda.

2. It is because of the unlimited and unconditional support that Uganda continues to render to the rebel movement in the southern Sudan (the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA)) that the borders between the two countries are no longer under the control of the Government of the Sudan. To find pretexts and justifications for the military, logistic and political support for the rebel movement in the southern Sudan, the Government of Uganda has tended to attribute any incidents or attacks on its forces by the Ugandan rebels to the Government of the Sudan.

3. The military, logistic and political support of the Government of Uganda to the rebels of the SPLA has been authenticated even by the Western media, the last but not the least example of which was the report of The New York Times Magazine of 3 March 1996, which explicitly stated these facts. Moreover, the fact that the rebel leader John Garang of the SPLA in using Kampala as his headquarters stands alone as evidence for the Government of Uganda's conspiratory policies against the stability, territorial integrity and security of the Sudan. In addition to the provision of sanctuary and recruiting and training camps for the rebels, the Government of Uganda has continued to facilitate the channelling of military and financial assistance to the rebels from sources external and hostile to the Sudan.

4. The most flagrant and provocative act of aggression perpetrated by Uganda against the Sudan was its full-scale participation with men, tanks and artillery in invading Sudanese territory starting on 25 October 1995, with logistic support from certain neighbouring and external circles, which was videotaped and handed to the Government of Uganda. The invasion was directed against Farajuk and Magwe, causing loss of civilian life and property. It constituted a blatant violation of the sovereignty and territory integrity of the Sudan and of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Owing to the conspiracy of silence by some Powers, such aggression has passed uncondemned by those who continue to highlight the fabricated Ugandan allegations against the Sudan.

5. The activities of hostility against the Sudan by Uganda have not been confined to the prolongation of the civil war in the southern Sudan through its direct and indirect involvement. Uganda, in pursuing its machinations to destabilize the Sudan, has opted to make the Sudan a scapegoat for its internal differences and conflicts, while taking part in the orchestrated plot against the Sudan. This attitude from the side of Uganda was evidenced, in particular, when Uganda intentionally used to foil any initiative to normalize its relations

with the Sudan. When the Presidents of the Sudan and Uganda met in Vienna upon a kind initiative by the President of Austria in June 1994, Uganda did not honour the commitments it made in Vienna, thus leading to the termination of the Sudanese monitoring team in September 1994. Similarly, and only five days after the signing of the Tripoli Declaration for Normalization between the two countries on 5 April 1995, Uganda fabricated certain allegations as a pretext for expelling the Head of Mission of the Sudan in Kampala. The harassments of the Head and members of the Sudanese Mission were witnessed by the dean and members of the foreign diplomatic staff in an unprecedented manner and in flagrant violation of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961. These acts of hostility culminated in the unilateral severing by Uganda of diplomatic relations with the Sudan on 23 April 1995. Later and upon the kind initiative of the President of Malawi to prevent the escalation of tension between the two countries, the President of the Sudan met with the President of Uganda in Blantyre and agreed on a communiqué on 11 June 1995 in which it was agreed that a multilateral monitoring team would be composed by the two countries in addition to Malawi to verify any claims impeding the normalization of relations. Uganda's attitude continued to be negative. It resorted to delaying the work of the team by not presenting the names of its representatives on the team and failed to show up at two meetings of the team, the latest of which was scheduled for 14 and 15 February 1996.

6. The active participation of Uganda in the hostile campaign against the Sudan by its note contained in document S/1996/288 of 16 April 1996 and in the deliberations of the Security Council concerning the adoption of its resolution 1054 (1996) of 26 April 1996, despite the declaration of the summit of the Intergovernmental Authority for Drought and Development in Nairobi on 1 March 1996, were a matter of disappointment to the Sudan. At that summit the Heads of State and Government of the countries of the Intergovernmental Authority committed themselves to solving current problems and conflicts in the subregion as a prerequisite for its development and prosperity. However, it seems that Uganda has opted to continue to play the role assigned to it by external forces in destabilizing the region without any consideration for the aspirations and efforts of the region towards achieving peace, security, prosperity and development.